DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 721 EA 015 571

AUTHOR Carson, Joan C.; Owen, Scottie
TITLE Parental Attitudes concerning the Use, Ethics and Legality of Corporal Punishment and Rewards in the Elementary Classroom.
INSTITUTION Mississippi Univ., University. Bureau of Educational Research.
PUB DATE Jun 82
NOTE 9p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Research in Education; v14 n3 Jun 1982

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Corporal Punishment; *Discipline Policy; Elementary Education; *Parent Attitudes; *Rewards; Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Baker v Owen

ABSTRACT

Parental attitudes toward rewards for student behavior and academic achievement as well as toward corporal punishment were assessed. The sample consisted of 195 parents from northern Mississippi. University students administered the anonymous questionnaire. Among the results was that 75 percent queried would not approve teachers being allowed to use any method of discipline they chose to impose order. Almost two-thirds disapproved of the use of material rewards for good behavior. One-third of the sample rated giving children toys or food for learning or good behavior as ethically wrong. Seventy percent agreed that using rewards for learning will make a child expect more rewards. Parents generally disapproved of using any type of edible reward in the classroom. Ninety-seven percent approved of the use of praise as a reward. Respondents generally favored teachers being allowed to paddle students. Regarding the "Baker" decision concerning corporal punishment, three-fourths of the sample recognized the necessity of having a witness present during a paddling. Fifty-eight percent were aware that teachers have to show that other forms of discipline were tried before paddling. Approximately two-thirds of the group were aware of the requirements for a written report and forewarning. (JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joan C. Carson
Scottie Owen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED228721

JUNE, 1982 VOLUME 14 NUMBER 3

PARENTAL ATTITUDES CONCERNING THE USE, ETHICS AND LEGALITY OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND REWARDS IN THE ELEMENTARY CLASSROOM

by
Joan C. Carson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Education
and
Scottie Owen
Doctoral Student

Introduction

Most adults have at some point heard and/or voiced at least one of the following statements:

"Spare the rod; spoil the child."

"Rewarding a child is bribery."

"If you praise them, they will get a swelled head."

"Why should a child be rewarded for good behavior? I wasn't, and I turned out fine."

"They ought to do well because that's what they're supposed to do."

"A little tanning every once in a while is good for the soul; keeps them in line."

Both parents and school personnel are concerned with issues related to discipline and effective techniques for the management of children's classroom behavior. Parental preoccupation with classroom discipline was again made evident in the Thirteenth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes toward Public Schools (Gallup, 1981, p. 34). In fact, for the past twelve out of thirteen years discipline has been ranked by the public in the Gallup polls as the number one problem facing the public schools (Gallup, 1978, p. 34). Classroom control and the need to have pupils behave appropriately is an often-cited teacher concern (Cruickshank, 1982). Kindsvatter (1978, p. 322) stated

> Classroom management is an inescapable part of teaching. It must be among the first considerations of the teacher, for without a favorable classroom climate very little teaching or learning will occur. So while there is no single definition of the good teacher, every good teacher must by definition be competent in classroom management.

Competency in and selection of appropriate classroom management procedures continues to be a major concern not only of parents and school personnel but also of teacher educators and researchers. Classroom discipline has been the subject of varied and controversial litigation. Furthermore, behavioral psychologists and educational researchers have focused public attention on a variety of behavioral-reward strategies for modifying behavior and/or maintaining discipline in the classroom. Administrators, parents, teachers and researchers, however, often have their own ideas of how to discipline and motivate children and it is not unusual for there to be discrepancies among these groups' philosophies about the management of children's classroom behavior.

School personnel can be effective with the discipline-management strategies they use if parents agree with and support the teachers' use of selected strategies. However, teachers do not have parental support when/if parent and teacher philosophies are widely divergent and/or if parents view teachers' use of selected management strategies (reward systems or corporal punishment) as morally or ethically inappropriate. It is important then to know parental attitudes toward a variety of disciplinary and classroom management approaches.

The study reported here is the second in a series of projects by the researcher on parental attitudes and issues related to discipline and behavior management techniques. The first study (Carson, 1981) appeared in this same publication. In that 1979-1980 survey of 550 parents and teachers the respondents were polled concerning (1) the appropriateness of the classroom use of edible and material rewards and (2) the frequency of classroom and home use of corporal punishment. Results of that study indicated that an overwhelming majority of the respondents used, supported, and advocated paddling, considered material rewards to be bribery, and objected to the classroom use of edible rewards. The research reported herein (the second study) was a follow-up project which attempted (1) to more specifically assess parental attitudes toward a greater variety of reward strategies for both appropriate behavior as well as academic achievement and (2) to assess in depth parental attitudes about the use, ethics and legal issues related to the use of corporal punishment in the classroom.

EA 015 571

Methodology, Sample and Survey Instrument

Students in the researcher's classes at The University of Mississippi were required to poll parents to ascertain their attitudes concerning the use, ethics and legality of corporal punishment and three reinforcement strategies in the elementary classroom. The survey was conducted by means of a 25 item questionnaire written and field-tested by the researchers. Questionnaires were individually administered by students to respondents. The survey was conducted during the first summer semester, June, 1982.

Students were instructed to select, in so far as feasible, a representative sample (by sex, race, and age) of parents as respondents. The students were trained in the proper administration of the questionnaire and in the recording of responses. While subjects were personally administered the questionnaire, no names of respondents were recorded and the respondents' anonymity was assured. The researchers compiled the results and analyzed the data as described herein.

The sample for the study consisted of 195 parents primarily from the North Mississippi area. There were twice as many females (N = 134) as males (N = 61). Of the 195 parents questioned, 150 (77%) were white and 45 (23%) were black. The respondents' ages are described in Figure 1.

Figure 1
Distribution of Respondents' Ages

Age	Number	(Percent of Sample)
20-29	36	(18)
30-39	75	(38)
40-49	52	(27)
50-59	25	(13)
60-69	6	(3)
70-79	1	(1)
	195	100%

The results of the study are presented by totals and percentages for the entire sample in Tables I-V.

The survey instrument required parents to respond with "strongly disagree", "disagree", "no response or opinion", "agree", or "strongly agree" to 21 of the 25 questions. The last four items were true-false. The first item on the questionnaire assessed parental attitudes about the degree of latitude teachers should have in managing children's behavior at school. Items 2-15 on the survey instrument related to the classroom use of rewards or reinforcers for academic achievement and appropriate classroom behavior. More specifically, items 2-5 concerned material (or tangible) rewards; items 6-10 concerned the ethics of material and edible rewards; items 11-14 concerned edible rewards; and item 15 concerned the social reinforcer of teacher praise.

Items 16-25 on the questionnaire related to parental perceptions of teachers' classroom use of corporal punishment. More specifically, items 16 and 17 related to teacher versus parental authority "to paddle or not to paddle", while items 18 and 19 concerned the appropriateness of teacher aides or principals to administer a paddling. There were also two philosophical questions (20 and 21) about paddling and discipline. The final four items on the questionnaire (22-25) concerned legal issues related to the classroom use of corporal punishment.

Results and Discussion

The first item on the questionnaire was, "My child's teacher should be able to use any method of discipline to keep my child well-behaved at school." Seventy-five percent of the sample disagreed, four parents (2%) had no response and 18 percent agreed with the statement. Though more parents disapproved than approved of teachers using "any" method of discipline to keep a child well-behaved at school, there were 10 parents (5%) of the sample who strongly agreed with teachers using "any" method of discipline.

Items 2-5 concerned the classroom use of material (or tangible) rewards for academic achievement and appropriate classroom behavior. The results for these items appear in Table I.

Almost two-thirds of the parents polled (63%) opposed the use of a material reward (like a toy) for good behavior (item 2), and 34 percent approved such a use of material rewards. However on item 4, only 52 percent of the parents opposed giving a child a toy-material reward for "learning and doing well in school", and 44 percent favored such a practice. It is interesting to note that the parents sampled slightly favored teacher use of material rewards for students' "learning and doing well in school" rather than for "being well-behaved."

The results for items 3 and 5 were consistent with the results for items 2 and 4. Fifty-three percent of the parents considered the use of material rewards for good behavior to be bribery while 50 percent of the respondents considered the use of material rewards for academic achievement to be bribery. Approximately 40 percent of the sample did not consider material rewards to be bribery. Twice as many parents gave no response to items 3 and 5 than to items 2 and 4 indicating, perhaps among other things, their reluctance to label rewards as bribes.

Items 6-10 concerned the ethics and morality of material and edible rewards for academic achievement

RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Volume 14, Number 3 June, 1982

Published by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677

Sylvester A. Moorhead, Dean

Bureau of Educational Research

Bob N. Cage, Director

The University complies with all applicable laws regarding affirmative action and equal opportunity in all its activities and programs and does not discriminate against anyone protected by law because of age, creed, color, national origin, race, religion, sex, handicap, veteran or other status.

Table I
Number and Percent of Responses from Parents

	Items	SD N(%)	D N(%)	NR N(%)	A N(%)	SA N(%)
2.	I approve of my child's teacher giving my child little rewards like toys, for being well behaved.	30(15)	94(48)	5(3)	64(33)	2(1)
3.	If a teacher uses material rewards for good behavior, I think that is bribery.	9(5)	67(34)	15(8)	82(42)	22(11)
4.	I approve of my child's teacher giving my child small material rewards for learning and doing well in school.	18(9)	84(43)	9(4)	79(41)	5(3)
5.	If a teacher uses material rewards for helping a child learn and do well in school, I think that is bribery.	13(7)	69(35)	16(8)	82(42)	15(8)

and appropriate classroom behavior. The results for these items appear in Table II.

Items 6 and 7 related to whether giving rewards (like toys or food) for academic achievement and good behavior, respectively, is wrong ethically and morally. On both of these questions almost one-fifth of the group gave no response. Thirty-four percent of the parents rated giving children toys or food for learning (item 6) as ethically and morally wrong when compared with 39 percent of the parents who rated giving toys or food for good behavior as ethically and morally wrong. Approximately 45 percent of the sample had no ethical or moral problems with material or edible rewards.

The results for items 6 and 7 were consistent with the results described for items 2 and 4: parents slightly, but consistently, gave greater acceptance to rewards when used for students' academic achievement than for students' good behavior. Totals for items 6 and 7 were also consistent with the results for items 3 and 5: between one-third and two-fifths of the sample perceived material and edible rewards as wrong ethically and morally and/or as bribery.

The results for item 8 are noteworthy for the unanimity of the parents' responses. Seventy percent of the sample agreed with the statement that "Giving a child rewards like toys or food for learning will make the child expect more rewards for the more they do." Most probably, the reasoning implicit in this item is the philosophical basis for parents' objections to material or edible rewards for student achievement.

Results for item 9 were similar to those on item 8. Forty-eight percent of the respondents agreed and 40 percent disagreed with the idea that some children might misbehave just to be rewarded for good behavior.

Table II
Number and Percent of Responses from Parents

	Items	SD N(%)	D N(%)	NR N(%)	A N(%)	SA N(%)
6.	Giving a child rewards like toys or food for learning is ethically and morally wrong.	22(11)	69(35)	38(20)	54(28)	12(6)
7.	Giving a child rewards like toys or food for good behavior is ethically and morally wrong.	19(10)	66(34)	34(17)	63(32)	13(7)
8.	Giving a child rewards like toys or food for learning will make the child expect more rewards for the more they do.	4(2)	41(21)	14(7)	110(57)	26(13)
9.	Giving the child in a class rewards like toys or food for good behavior will cause other children to misbehave just so they can be rewarded for good behavior.	9(5)	69(35)	32(12)	77(39)	17(9)
10.	Giving one child in a class rewards like toys or food for learning is unfair to other children.	6(3)	59(30)	10(5)	94(49)	26(13)

Table III
Number and Percent of Responses from Parents

	Items	SD N(%)	D N(%)	NR N(%)	A N(%)	SA N(%)
11.	I approve of my child's teacher rewarding my child with a cereal such as Trix or Sugar Pops for good behavior.	33(17)	118(61)	11(6)	31(15)	2(1)
12.	I approve of my child's teacher rewarding my child with M&M's or other small candies for good behavior.	36(18)	104(53)	9(5)	45(23)	1(1)
13.	I approve of my child's teacher rewarding my child with a cereal such as Trix or Sugar Pops for learning or doing well.	32(16)	112(57)	10(5)	40(21)	1(1)
14.	I approve of my child's teacher rewarding my child with M&M's or other small candies for learning and doing well.	32(16)	98(50)	9(5)	55(28)	1(1)

Two-thirds of the sample viewed the use of material or edible rewards to reward one child for learning as unfair to the other children in a class (item 10). More respondents answered this item than they did the other questions (6-7) that related to the ethics and morality of material and edible rewards for academic achievement and appropriate classroom behavior.

Parents' perceptions of the appropriateness of using edible rewards in the elementary classroom for academic achievement and appropriate classroom behavior were assessed by items 11-14 on the survey instrument. As per the directions on the instrument, parents were not required to respond to these items if they had a child with a food allergy or diabetes. Approximately five percent of the sample did not respond to these items.

Items 11 and 13 queried parents about the use of presweetened cereals (the traditional edible reward) to reward children's good behavior and learning and doing well, respectively. Items 12 and 14 assessed parents' attitudes concerning "M&M's or other small candies" for good behavior and learning and doing well. The results for items 11-14 appear in Table III.

Parents generally disapproved of the use of edible rewards in the classroom regardless of the type of reward (i.e. presweetened cereal or candy) or the particular behavior (i.e. appropriate behavior or learning or doing well.) In fact, for all the questions that related to the use of rewards, more parents objected to edible rewards than to the use of a material or social reward.

Seventy-eight percent of the parents were opposed to the use of cereals to reward good behavior (item 11) compared to 73 percent who were opposed to the use of cereals to reward learning and doing well (item 13). Sixteen percent of the parents approved the use of cereals to reward good behavior as compared with 22 percent who favored using cereals to reward learning and doing well.

That parents objected to the use of candy as a reward (items 12 and 14) is not unpredictable. The results on these items, in terms of parental objections, are surprisingly similar to those for items 11 and 13. Seventy-one percent (item 12) and 66 percent (item 14) of the parents, respectively, were opposed to the use of "M&M's" or other "small candies" for good behavior and for learning and doing well.

Twenty-four percent (item 12) and 29 percent (item 14) of the sample approved of the use of candy to reward good behavior and learning and doing well, respectively. When these results were compared to the results of items 11 and 12, eight percent more of the sample approved of candy, rather than cereal, to reward good behavior while nine percent more of the sample approved of cereal rather than candy to reward learning and doing well! The lack of parallelism in the responses may indicate, among other things: (1) respondents not clearly differentiating among the four questions; (2) parental assignment of a greater reinforcing value to candy than to cereal, and/or; (3) parental belief that appropriate behavior is more rewardable than is learning and doing well.

Item 15 was, "I approve of my child's teacher praising my child for good behavior and doing well in school." This was the only item that assessed parental perceptions of the value of the use of the social reinforcer of praise. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents approved of teacher praise of a child for good behavior and doing well in school (36 percent "agreed" and 61 percent "strongly agreed"). For the remainder of the sample, one parent "strongly disagreed" with the use of teacher praise, three parents "disagreed" and two parents gave no response. The social reinforcer of praise (compared with material and edible rewards) was least objectionable and most approved of by the parents in this study.

While items 2-15 on the survey instrument related to parental perceptions of the appropriateness and ethics of the classroom use of rewards, items 16-21 related to parental perceptions of teachers' use of corporal

Table IV
Number and Percent of Responses from Parents

	Items	SD N(%)	D N(%)	NR N(%)	A N(%)	SA N(%)
16.	As a parent I should be the one to decide if a teacher can paddle my child if (when) my child misbehaves.	14(7)	109(56)	6(3)	42(22)	24(12)
17.	My child's teacher should be allowed to paddle my child for misbehaving even if I object to paddling.	42(24)	69(35)	20(10)	53(27)	7(4)
18.	If my child is to be paddled at school, it is alright if the teacher aide gives the paddling.	72(37)	92(47)	6(3)	24(12)	1(1)
19.	If my child is to be paddled at school, the paddling should only be done by the principal.	24(12)	105(54)	17(9)	43(22)	6(3)
20.	Children will behave and do well in school if they fear that if they do not, they will be paddled.	24(12)	86(44)	23(12)	51(26)	11(6)
21.	I believe in "spare the rod and spoil the child."	31(16)	68(35)	16(8)	62(32)	18(9)

punishment. Items 16 and 17 related to teacher versus parental authority to paddle, and items 18 and 19 concerned the appropriateness of teacher aides or principals to administer a paddling. Items 20 and 21 were philosophical type questions about paddling and discipline. The results for items 16-21 appear in Table IV.

Respondent agreement (34%) with item 16 would indicate that parents, instead of teachers, should make the decision concerning "to paddle or not to paddle" (i.e. pro-parent as decision-maker). Sixty-three percent of the parents polled, on the other hand, disagreed with item 16 and thought teachers, rather than parents, ought to make the decision relative "to paddle or not to paddle."

It is important to note that one item was expressed in terms of "decide if a teacher be allowed to paddle" rather than querying parents about situations requiring teacher discretion to employ any number of behavior control measures. Disagreement with item 17 would indicate that parents' objection to paddling should take precedence over teachers' decision to paddle a misbehaving child (i.e. pro-parent decision-maker).

Fifty-nine percent of the parents disagreed with item 17, "My child's teacher should be allowed to paddle my child for misbehaving even if I object to paddling." This was a larger percentage (+23%) than agreed on item 16, yet percentages agreeing on item 16 and those disagreeing on item 17 should have been almost the same. A similar discrepancy occurs between disagreement responses to item 16 (63%) and agreement responses to item 17 (31%). Ten percent of the parents had no response to item 17.

Items 18 and 19 asked parents about the appropriateness of teacher aides and principals paddling misbehaving children. Eighty-four percent of the parents disapproved of a teacher aide paddling and only 13 percent thought it appropriate for a teacher aide to paddle. On item 19, one-fourth of the group thought a paddling ought to be done only by the principal, although 66 percent disagreed with the item. Parents therefore disapproved of teacher aides paddling and slightly approved the idea of the principal as the only one who should paddle. When the results on items 16-19 are viewed together, it can be inferred that this sample tended to leave both the decision to paddle to the teacher and tended to approve of teachers and principals, more than teacher aides, as appropriate persons to administer a paddling.

There were two philosophical type items on the survey instrument, items 20 and 21. Though 12 percent of the sample gave no response to item 20, 56 percent of the parents disagreed with the statement, "Children will behave and do well in school if they fear that if they do not, they will be paddled." These responses may reflect the parents' realization of the ineffectiveness of paddlings and/or an unwillingness to interact with children on the negative, punitive basis implied by the item statement. However, it is important to note that almost one-third of the group (62 parents) agreed with item 20.

Less than half of the sample (41%) stated they believe in "spare the rod and spoil the child." Fifty-one percent of the sample disagreed with the item. Results on items 20 and 21 are generally consistent indicating more respondent reluctance than acceptance of threats of corporal punishment for control (20) or belief that not padding spoils children (21).

The last four items (22-25) on the survey instrument were of the true-false mode. The items related to the four classroom implications of the Baker decision (Flygare, 1976) concerning the use of corporal punishment in the schools. The results for these items are presented in Table V.

Table V
Number and Percent of Responses from Parents

	Items	True	False	NR
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)
22.	It is the law that if a child is paddled at school a witness has to be present.	145(74)	38(20)	12(6)
23.	It is the law that if a child is paddled at school, the school authorities have to provide parents with a written report detailing the incident if the parents request such a report.	132(68	51(26)	12(6)
24.	It is the law that teachers have to be able to show that they paddled a child only after all other less severe attempts at discipline failed.	113(58)	70(36)	12(6)
25.	It is the law that a child has to be forewarned that a specific misbehavior will lead to paddling.	120(62)	63(32)	12(6)

On item 22, 74 percent (145 respondents) knew that the law requires a witness to be present, if a paddling is administered; 20 percent (38 respondents) did not know, and six percent (12 respondents) gave no response. Sixty-eight percent (132 respondents) knew parents must be presented with a written report detailing the incident, if they request a report (item 23); 26 percent (51 respondents) had no knowledge of this aspect of the law, and six percent (12 respondents) did not answer. Item 24 stated that teachers have to be able to show that they paddled only after less severe attempts at discipline had failed. Of the 195 respondents, only 113 (58%) knew that this was a legal implication of the Baker decision; 70 (36%) did not know, and 12 (6%) did not respond. On item 25, "It is the law that a child has to be forewarned that a specific misbehavior will lead to paddling," 120 respondents (62%) were informed of this principle; 63 respondents (32%) were uninformed, and 12 respondents (6%) gave no response.

Summary

The first item on the survey instrument assessed parental attitudes about the degree of latitude teachers should have in managing children's behavior at school. More parents disapproved (75%) than approved (23%) of teachers being allowed to use any method of discipline to keep a child well-behaved at school.

There were four items concerning the use of material rewards in the classroom. Twice as many parents disapproved than approved of the use of a material reward, like a toy, for good behavior. Parents who agreed with the use of material rewards slightly favored the use of such rewards for students' learning and doing well rather than for being well-behaved. At least half of the respondents considered the use of material rewards to be bribery.

At least one-third of the sample rated giving children toys or food for learning or good behavior as ethically and morally wrong. However, the sample gave slightly greater acceptance to rewards when used for students' academic achievement than for students' good behavior.

The one item on which parents had the most unanimity of agreement was item 8. Seventy percent of the sample agreed with the statement that "giving a child rewards like toys or food for learning will make the child expect more rewards for the more they do." Given the general respondent opposition to the use of material and edible rewards, the results of this statement are important as well as insightful about parents' thoughts and philosophies relative to reward systems. Also noteworthy are these two results: (1) 48 percent of the parents agreed that some children might misbehave just to be rewarded for good behavior (item 9), and (2) 66 percent viewed the use of material or edible rewards to reward one child for learning as unfair to the other children in a class (item 10).

There were four items concerning the use of edible rewards (presweetened cereals and candies) to reward children's good behavior and learning and doing well. Parents generally disapproved of the use of any type of edible reward in the classroom and more parents objected to edible rewards than to the use of a material or social reward. For those in the sample who approved of edible rewards, responses were inconsistent. More parents approved of candy than cereal to reward good behavior while more parents approved of cereal than candy to reward learning and doing well.

One item (15) assessed parental perceptions of the value of the use of the social reinforcer of praise. Ninety-seven percent of the sample approved of the use of praise. The social reward of praise, therefore, is least objectionable to parents and deemed far more appropriate than are material and/or edible rewards.

There were six items on the survey that assessed parental attitudes about teachers' use of corporal punishment. Respondents generally favored teachers being allowed to paddle, and slightly approved of paddling being administered by the principal rather than by a teacher aide. There was also respondent reluctance concerning the use of a threat of corporal punishment for control (20) or belief that not paddling spoils children (21).

There were four questions about the legal implications of the Baker decision concerning the use of corporal punishment in the schools. The parents were most aware (three-fourths of the sample) of the necessity of having a witness present during a paddling. Respondents were least aware (58%) that teachers have to be able to show that they paddled a child only after other less severe attempts at discipline failed.

Approximately two-thirds of the group were aware of the written report (item 23) and forewarning (25) requirements.

Implications

Humane classroom control procedures that are effective and logical are necessary for both classroom teachers and administrators. There is a need for innovative ideas (Yannone, 1982), strategies, and suggestions that have been field tested and proven successful in achieving the goal of effective classroom management. Behavior modification approaches that stem from principles of operant conditioning are rational techniques that have been field-tested, proven workable and appropriate for the classroom and are easily utilized in school settings.

It is the researcher's opinion that knowledge of the basic principles of reinforcement and punishment theory would benefit anyone working with children or adults. While specialized training and information are necessary for the utilization of selected techniques (shaping, contracting, Premack Principle, contingencies, timeout, etc.), school personnel should at least be aware of basic principles concerning behavior and how behavior is affected by its consequences. It is also important for school personnel to ascertain conflicting home-school ideas concerning discipline and to be aware of legal implications concerning tangible rewards and the use of physical punishment before using any method of management for disciplinary purposes. Commercial publishers and the NEA have available a number of texts, materials, and inservice workshops concerning discipline and effective classroom management strategies that can be beneficial to both teachers and administrators.

It is also important that school personnel describe behavior specifically and objectively and, above all, not label children. The behavior therapy model for changing behavior centers on altering the behaviors' consequences rather than trying to discover the causes for behavior. In most cases anyhow, the teacher cannot control antecedent conditions. Teachers, therefore, should concentrate on developing precise techniques in being positive, approving, and supportive of children's behaviors and accomplishments and should work toward rewarding academic or behavioral improvement. Becker, Englemann, and Thomas (1971) advise teachers to give attention to the child when the child is behaving appropriately instead of when the child is misbehaving. Peer/parental input and support of behavior change/discipline programs should be encouraged and solicited in order to strengthen the effectiveness of any management approach (Stoops and Stoops, 1981). Consequence management should be the focal point of any approach used for discipline rather than managing behavior by punitive measures, ridicule, and humiliation.

Any disciplinary technique that is utilized should be evaluated. Such evaluation should be in terms of how well it is working, its humane and democratic qualities, and the good that will be derived from it both for the individual child and for the entire class. Many educators and psychologists including the authors of this paper condemn the use of physical punishment in the classroom because of the variety of problems associated with its use. Yet in spite of the growing evidence of the myriad of harmful effects associated with corporal punishment, it continues to be a frequently applied strategy in schools both in Mississippi and nationally (facilitated by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1977 Baker decision).

It is beyond the scope of this paper though to cite the numerous philosophical and ethical problems associated with the use of physical punishment. Since corporal punishment is used by school personnel, however, it is imperative that they become informed of the legal considerations concerning the use of this method. Though the states of Massachusetts and New Jersey prohibit corporal punishment, the other states, including Mississippi, generally permit the reasonable use of corporal punishment (local school board option).

As corporal punishment is still widely practiced (despite the availability of more humanitarian approaches to behavior management), there are four due process principles, then, that need to be observed by school personnel if corporal punishment is used. Flygare (1976) in his analysis of the Baker decision on corporal punishment lists the following principles which, until new litigation alters the decision, makes these principles still effective:

1. teachers warn that specific misbehavior will result in spanking;
2. spanking is used only after less drastic deterrants fail;
3. children are spanked only in the company of another staff member; and
4. report provided to parents (if they so request).

The due process implications are presented for information purposes because of their protective functions to all parties involved. Their inclusion here, however, is not to be construed as the authors' sanctioning of corporal punishment. Administrators have a responsibility to dispense this information to all school personnel for everyone's protection.

It is also important to note that the Baker decision relating to procedural due process does not alter the well-established principle that the use of excessive force against students may constitute cruel and unusual punishment. Furthermore, there are legal problems concerning the use of corporal punishment relative to Title IX and civil rights protections. Traditionally such punishment has been viewed in a racially discriminatory manner and given to disproportionately more male than female students.

Further compounding the problem is the fact that some teachers may exceed their authority and abuse children and thereby be confronted with legal, ethical, and moral problems. Englander (1978) points out that the schools are the sole public institutions that are legally allowed to administer physical punishment. Even though the courts have specified the conditions and rendered guidelines for the use of corporal punishment, such conditions and guidelines are often (albeit accidentally) violated. Therefore we suggest that school boards, parental organizations, teacher educators, teachers, and administrators work together

to formulate and implement disciplinary measures to replace corporal punishment. Administrators would do well to provide incentives and other necessary support services to facilitate teachers' use of effective and humane management strategies. Provision of inservice education for teachers in specific, easily implementable behavioral strategies for classroom management is indicated. Teachers need administrative help and support to become confident and skilled in a variety of proven and alternative means of discipline. School personnel, like students, can always improve on their effectiveness. They just need to follow their own advice and "keep trying."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, W. C., Englemann, S. and Thomas, D. R. *Teaching: A Course in Applied Psychology.* Palo Alto: Science Research Associates, 1971.

Carson, Joan C. "Adults' Attitudes About Two Discipline Strategies: Rewards and Corporal Punishment." *Research in Education,* Volume 13, No. 2, February, 1981.

Cruickshank, Donald R. "Five Areas of Teacher Concern." *Phi Delta Kappan,* March 1982, 63, 460.

Englander, Meryl E. "The Courts Corporal Punishment Mandate to Parents, Local Authorities and the Profession," *Phi Delta Kappan,* April 1978, 529-532.

Flygare, Thomas J. "Procedural Due Process Now Applies to Corporal Punishment," *Phi Delta Kappan,* January 1976, 346.

Flygare, Thomas J. "The Supreme Court Approves Corporal Punishment," *Phi Delta Kappan,* January 1978, 59, 347-348.

Gallup, George H. "The 10th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan,* September 1978, 60, 33-44.

Gallup, George H. "The Thirteenth Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan,* September 1981, 63, 33-47.

Kindsvatter, Richard. "A New View of the Dynamics of Discipline." *Phi Delta Kappan,* January 1978, 59, 322.

Stoops, Emery and Joyce King-Stoops. "Discipline Suggestions for Classroom Teachers," *Phi Delta Kappan,* September 1981, 58.

Yannone, Denise S. "Behavioral Change Through Story Therapy," *Phi Delta Kappan,* May 1982, 635.

Get The Olympic Spirit

The University of Mississippi

RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Published by the Bureau of Educational Research, School of Education, University, Mississippi

University, MS 38677

CLEARINGHOUSE ON TESTS
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
ROOM B018
PRINCETON, NJ 08541

MIXED STATES